DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 278 960 CS 008 693

AUTHOR Winograd, Peter; Osborn, Jean

TITLE Textbook Adoption in Kentucky. Reading Education Report No. 64.

INSTITUTION Bolt, Beranek and Newman, Inc., Cambridge, Mass.; Illinois Univ., Urbana. Center for the Study of Reading.

SPONS AGENCY National Inst. of Education (ED), Washington, DC.
PUB DATE Mar 86
CONTRACT 400-81-0030
NOTE 31p.
PUB TYPE Reports - Evaluative/Feasibility (142)

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC02 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS Advisory Committees; Basal Reading; Elementary Education; *Evaluation Criteria; Feedback; Reader Text Relationship; Reading Comprehension; *Reading Instruction; *Reading Materials; Reading Processes; Reading Programs; Reading Skills; Teacher Attitudes; *Textbook Evaluation; *Textbook Selection
IDENTIFIERS Evaluation Standards; *Kentucky State Department of Education; *State Level Textbook Adoption

ABSTRACT

Kentucky is one of twenty-four states that rely upon a state adoption process for selecting school textbooks, a procedure that occurs every six years. Publishers' bids are solicited and evaluated by the State Textbook Commission, and the Textbook Selection Criteria Committee for Reading makes recommendations that will be of help to people selecting reading programs. At issue in 1983 was how to develop a set of criteria that would incorporate current information from reading comprehension research, but that would not exclude essentially all of the programs currently on the market. Teachers wanted a guide that would help them select a published reading program that focused on the objectives for which they were to be held accountable. One political consideration that had an immediate impact on the textbook adoption process was that the Kentucky legislature did not appropriate sufficient funds for purchase of all the textbooks approved. Results of a local school district survey showed that many districts were pleased with this development, since they were content with the reading programs they were using and expressed relief that they would not have to undergo the disruptive one- to two-year period of adjustment associated with learning how to implement a new basal program. (Appendix includes guides for evaluating basal reading series.) (NKA)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED278960

CENTER FOR THE STUDY OF READING

Reading Education Report No. 64

TEXTBOOK ADOPTION IN KENTUCKY

Peter Winograd
University of Kentucky
Jean Osborn
University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign

March 1986

University of Illinois
at Urbana-Champaign
51 Gerty Drive
Champaign, Illinois 61820

Bolt Beranek and Newman, Inc.
10 Moulton Street
Cambridge, Massachusetts 02238

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

X This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.

☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality

• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy

The work upon which this publication is based was performed pursuant to Contract No. 400-81-0030 of the National Institute of Education. It does not, however, necessarily reflect the views of the agency.

CS 008693

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

How Adoption of Reading Textbooks Works in Kentucky: Some Problems and Some Solutions

The process Kentucky followed in 1983 for a reading adoption is the topic of this paper. We attempt to describe how the process was organized, some of the major problems the adoption committees faced, how the committees attempted to solve these problems, and how it all ended. We will focus on some of the problems faced by one adoption committee as it developed the Kentucky Guide for Evaluating Basal Reading Series. But first, we begin with general descriptions of textbook adoption and reading programs.

The process used to make decisions about textbooks is important because it determines which textbooks will be used in classrooms--in individual schools, in school districts, and in many cases, entire states. How a textbook adoption process is carried out depends, in part, upon the state in which the adoption is taking place. In 24 states, considered adoption states, a number of textbooks are selected by a committee (usually appointed by the governor) and put on a list of state approved textbooks. Local school districts within the state must select textbooks from this list if they are to use state funds to purchase their books. In other states, described by publishers' sales people as "open territory," the selection of textbooks is carried out by committees representing either an entire school district, a group of schools, or even just one school. Textbook adoption cycles, whether at the local level, the school district level, or the state level occur about every six or seven years.

Most educators would probably caution that, in elementary school classrooms, the importance of the textbook is secondary to that of the classroom teacher. Substantial evidence--some from classroom observation studies (Durkin, 1981; Mason & Osborn, 1983; Shannon, 1983), and some from more informal classroom observation and discussion with teachers--indicates that elementary teachers rely heavily upon textbooks as they teach reading, other language arts, mathematics, science, and social studies. Some classroom observers have attempted to estimate how much of what students and teachers engage in at school originates in textbooks. Some of these studies have been specifically concerned with how time is spent during reading periods. The estimates are that from 75% to 95% of the time spent during periods of reading instruction is determined by the content of textbooks used in the classroom (EPIE, 1977; Fisher, Berliner, Filby, Marliave, Cohen, Dishaw, & Moore, 1978).

When considering this information, it is important to keep in mind that reading instruction emanates not only from the textbook--the "readers" that students hold in their laps or lay on their desks as they read aloud or to themselves--but also from the many other parts of what can be described as the textbook package. Reading textbooks are imbedded in "systems" or "series" that are known as basal reading programs. Basal reading programs typically contain a course of reading instruction that begins in kindergarten and continues through the eighth grade. Basal reading programs are creatures of many parts: teachers' guides, readers, workbooks, ditto masters, testing and management plans,

and an enormous number of supplementary (but optional) items, for example, drill cards, sentence charts, film strips, supplementary readers, remedial workbooks, and audio tapes. The classroom observation research noted above indicates that basal reading programs account very directly for much of what is taught, practiced, and read during reading periods.

How are basal reading programs used? Teachers use the teachers' guides as sources for instructional activities and the tests to help them assess students' progress. Students read from the textbooks to practice their developing reading skill. Students use the workbooks and other paper and pencil materials for other kinds of practice. Teachers and students find many uses for the other items in a basal reading program: charts containing words and sentences can save the teacher a lot of time (what's already on a chart doesn't have to be copied onto a blackboard); word cards can be used for drill with students who need extra practice; film strips and accompanying taped stories can keep one group of students busy (and even entertained), while a teacher works with another group; extra workbooks can be used with slower students, while supplementary readers can be used with accelerated students. It seems apparent that, as textbook adoption committees go about the task of selecting reading textbooks, their concern must be not only with the textbooks students read, but also with the numerous and interrelated components of the published instructional programs so commonplace in American schools.

What components of basal programs do adoption committee members spend most of their very limited time reviewing? Research about textbook adoption committees at work is relatively new (Courtland, Farr, Harris, Tarr & Treece, 1983; Farr & Tulley, 1985; Farr, Tulley, & Rayford, 1984; Powell, 1985; Tulley, 1983). These studies, as well as information from informal surveys indicate that adoption committees spend most of their time surveying the readers, the teachers' guides, and the testing programs.

The Adoption of Textbooks in the State of Kentucky

Kentucky is 1 of 24 states that rely upon a state adoption process for selecting school textbooks. In any given subject area, textbooks are evaluated and adopted every six years. Over 100 state statutes and administrative regulations cover the adoption process for subject area textbooks (Kentucky Department of Education, 1982).

Two committees are important to the adoption of reading programs: the State Textbook Commission and the Textbook Selection Criteria Committee for Reading. At the beginning of each adoption cycle the Superintendent of Public Instruction appoints a State Textbook Commission composed of teachers, public school administrators, university faculty, and lay citizens. Each of the 10 members of the Textbook Commission serves for four years. The membership in this commission rotates--every two years two members leave and two new members join the group.

An early step in the adoption process is the Superintendent of Public Instruction's call for publishers' bids. Publishers

who submit a bid must also submit a concise article describing the philosophy and content of their programs. The State Textbook Commission is charged with the responsibility of evaluating all of the published textbook programs submitted and selecting those (usually 10) textbook programs they consider most appropriate to use in Kentucky during the next six years. Typically, whether the subject be reading, mathematics, or health science, the Commission meets in the summer months. Included on the agendas of these meetings are reports from publishers submitting bids, reports from teachers and administrators, and testimonials from concerned citizens.

The Superintendent of Public Information is empowered to formulate criteria that will help both the State Textbook Commission and local school districts in the selection and adoption process. In recent years the Superintendent of Public Instruction has appointed a Textbook Selection Criteria Committee for Reading. This Committee is directed to formulate criteria that will be of help to people selecting reading programs. The intent is that the work of the Criteria Committee for Reading would help both the State Textbook Commission and the local school districts make more informed decisions as they examine textbooks. The Criteria Committee must complete its work and make its recommendations before the Textbook Selection Commission Committee begins its deliberations in the summer.

For the reading textbook adoption projected for the 1985-86 school year, the members of the Criteria Committee for Reading were appointed in February of 1984. One of the authors of this

paper (Winograd) was appointed to this committee. The committee was directed to report its recommendations to the State Textbook Commission Committee by July of 1984.

The remainder of this paper will describe some problems--both pedagogical and political--faced by the Criteria Committee. One of the pedagogical problems the Committee attempted to resolve derives from recent research about the nature of reading comprehension: How could the implications for comprehension instruction emerging from current research be aligned with the traditional array of comprehension "skills" that are such an evident feature of the scope and sequence charts in most basal reading programs? The political problems the committee faced are familiar to anyone who has ever served on a textbook selection committee. First, members of state or local committees involved with textbook adoption are often subjected to pressure from individuals and groups outside the committee who feel that their strong beliefs about reading instruction should be represented in the reading programs selected for the state. Second, textbooks are expensive, and adoption committees must often work under the constraints of limited financial resources.

Pedagogical Considerations

The Kentucky Criteria Committee developed a guide for evaluating and comparing reading programs (see Appendix). The Committee examined a number of existing textbook evaluation instruments obtained from other state departments of education, local school districts, publishing companies, and professional journals. The Committee then identified the information it

wanted to include in a complete evaluation guide. For the most part, Committee members agreed about concerns to be addressed, the form the guide should take, and the questions it should contain.

The Committee did not agree, however, about how comprehension instruction should be described. At issue was how to develop a set of criteria that would incorporate current information from reading comprehension research, but that would not exclude essentially all of the programs currently on the market. The problem grew more complex when the Committee considered comprehension subskills. Nearly all of the major basal reading programs approach reading comprehension as a series of subskills (Johnson & Barrett, 1981). Yet, current research[1] indicates that an alternative view of reading comprehension is more appropriate. A dilemma was evident; the Committee wanted to incorporate into its criteria as current a view of comprehension as possible so that those who were examining reading programs would be aware of the changing views of comprehension (and the implication of those views to reading instruction). Yet, they wanted to produce a document that would be of help to people examining the skill-based comprehension instruction common to existing programs.

Efforts in the state of Michigan towards the re-definition of comprehension were of particular interest to the Kentucky group. In 1982, the Michigan Department of Education had asked the Michigan Reading Association to review the state performance objectives in reading. The Michigan Department of Education

planned to use these performance objectives to revise the Michigan State Assessment Test. The Michigan Reading Association's first step was to consider how the state's current definition of reading (developed in 1977) could be changed to incorporate the implications of recent research findings. This is the 1977 definition of reading they considered:

> The Department's definition of reading is based upon the assumption that the only legitimate, final outcome of reading instruction is comprehension. That is, although certain enabling word attack skills may be related to comprehension skills, mastery of these skills, in and of themselves and in the absence of comprehension is not a sufficient terminal objective for reading instruction.

The Michigan Reading Association responded to this definition as follows:

> In many respects this statement still holds true today. However, in 1977 when the present definition was adopted, our understanding of reading in general and comprehension in particular was more limited than it is today. At that time reading was conceptualized as a series of skills that were viewed as sequential and hierarchical (e.g., literal, inferential, and applied comprehension). Consequently, the objectives and the reading tests were aimed at proficiency in component skill areas such as contextual analysis, dictionary usage, literal and inferential comprehension. Recent research holds that reading is a dynamic process that involves the reader's ability to construct meaning through

> the interaction between information suggested by the written language and the reader's existing knowledge. As a result, difficulty is no longer viewed as an absolute property of a particular reading skill or task, but rather as a relative property of the interaction among specific reader, text, and instructional factors (Wixson & Peters, 1984, p. 4).

The Michigan Reading Association proposed a definition more commensurate with the current understanding of the reading process:

> Reading is the process of constructing meaning through the dynamic interaction among the reader's existing knowledge, the information suggested by the written language, and the context of the reading situation. (Wixson & Peters, 1984, p. 5)

That the Michigan Reading Association, advising the Michigan Department of Education, addressed the changing notion of reading comprehension is evident in their statement. The Kentucky Criteria Committee's attempts to address the same problem are evident in the introduction that appears in the 1985 version of the Kentucky Department of Education's "Guides for Evaluating Basal Reading Series" (see Appendix). This introduction includes statements that reflect important changes about the nature of reading instruction, "The goal of reading instruction is to produce independent, flexible readers. An independent flexible reader is one who can understand and use various written materials to achieve a variety of purposes."

The changing definition of comprehension also lead to some interesting compromises during the development of the Guide. The first draft of the Criteria Committee's Guide contained an extensive listing of possible objectives of comprehension instruction couched in the traditional terms of literal, inferential, and evaluative/critical skills. But the first draft also included a number of questions that reflected the concerns of current reading researchers. For example, there were questions that emphasized the relationships between students' background knowledge and the materials being read, as well as questions dealing with students' ability to use reading in a flexible manner.

This particular solution to the comprehension definition problem led to another problem--the first draft of the Criteria Committee's Guide was a twelve-page document containing over 60 different questions dealing with almost every aspect of the basal readers. It was obvious that this first draft was simply too long to be of much use to teachers. In response to this concern, the Kentucky Department of Education sponsored a meeting of teachers whose charge was to reduce the size of the guide and, hopefully, to increase the probability that it would actually be helpful to teachers in the field.

The teachers attending this meeting listened patiently to the Criteria Committee's concerns about how best to include the changing definition of comprehension in the guide. The teachers then proposed a more practical solution. They felt it was more important that the comprehension objectives of basal programs

match those in their local district curriculum guides or the recently developed and adopted 1984 Kentucky Essential Skills List, rather than yet another, and possibly different listing contained in the first draft of the Guide for Evaluating Basal Series. The teachers' logic was unassailable; they wanted a guide that would help them select a published reading program that focused on the objectives for which they were to be held accountable.

A brief digression is appropriate here. Separate divisions of the Kentucky Department of Education were responsible for developing the Guide for Evaluating Basal Series and the Kentucky Essential Skills List. Although both projects were initiated and completed at about the same time, there was little communication among the various committees and development teams. The lack of communication can be traced to a number of causes: the sheer complexity of each task, the increased confusion that occurs when more committees get involved in decision-making, the pressures of different timelines and different mandates, and so on. Nonetheless, the teachers' solution to the comprehension dilemma points out the wisdom of, and the need for, increased coordination in the development of various reading policies, at both the state and the federal level (e.g., Allington, 1986).

In addition to helping resolve the comprehension dilemma, the teachers made a number of suggestions about the wording of some of the questions in the Guides and suggested adding or deleting others. They also suggested that in place of one long guide, two shorter guides be developed. The first, The Teacher's

Guide, should not exceed two pages in length so that it could be used by teachers who did not have time to evaluate an entire series, but who were interested in examining reading series for their specific grades. The second, The Committee's Guide, should be a longer document designed for use by teachers with enough time to make a complete examination of an entire series.

The final version of the Guides for Evaluating Basal Reading Series benefited a great deal from the teachers' suggestions. The Guides are brief enough to be practical, yet long enough to provide help for teachers to compare various basal reading series. They are being used, along with local curriculum guides and the Kentucky Essential Skills List, by teachers in Kentucky to help them evaluate the content of basal reading programs.

Political Considerations

The politics of textbook adoption is a favorite subject of many writers and has been well-documented (Bowler, 1978; English, 1980; Goldstein, 1978; Helfrey, 1979; Keith, 1981). Studies examining the relationship between social science and social policy (Caplan, 1979; Lindblom & Cohen, 1979) indicate that upper-level social policy decisions are often based upon "soft knowledge" (opinions, assumptions, and beliefs), rather than on "hard" knowledge (technical and scientific data). Although these studies were concerned with areas other than reading, the influence of "soft knowledge" on the textbook adoption process underscores the importance of dealing with the full range of public opinion--regardless of whether the opinions are based on exaggerated information, misinformation, or good information.

An example of exaggerated information appeared in a book review in several Kentucky newspapers. Copies of this review were sent to the Kentucky Department of Education with a request that they be sent to all members of the textbook adoption committees. The message of the review is evident from the following excerpts:

> In 1955 Rudolf Flesch, in his best seller, Why Johnny Can't Read, told the American public specifically why public schools were failing: Most students never learn to read. Why? . . . The reading textbooks teach by the look-and-say (sight-reading) method, rather than by phonics. And now Why Johnny Still Can't Read tells us why again . . .
> This paperback edition of Why Johnny Still Can't Read is especially timely in Kentucky. The state textbook committee now is preparing a list of publishers and textbooks which will be available for adoption by Kentucky schools in 1985 . . .
>
> Of the current reading books adopted by Kentucky in 1979, only one . . . uses the phonics method . . . The other nine giants . . . all teach the look-and-say (flash card) approach . . . Flesch charges, "Clearly the U.S. literacy rate, now down to that of Burma and Albania, will drop even lower. The illiterates, plus the slow readers, are now a majority of the U.S. population." . . . This excellent book concludes by referring to Russia's use of phonics. Except for 2 to 3%, all Russian children can read at the end

of first grade. "No words are taught by the sight method." (Drew, February 12, 1984, p. E-4)

While it is difficult to determine who is saying what in the review, the statement about illiterates and slow readers being a "majority of the U.S. population" is surely not based on hard data. And although how best to teach beginning reading is still a matter of some controversy among reading educators and the public, to blame all the problems of reading achievement on how beginning reading is taught is indeed simple-minded. That thoughtful and troubled citizens are concerned about the reading achievement of the young citizens of their state is to be applauded. That their understanding of the problems of teaching all young children in Kentucky to read well will be enhanced by the information in such an article is of doubt. Inaccurate and inflammatory articles in the popular press reach a much larger audience than do the reports of serious researchers of reading. One continual task for reading professionals--including adoption committees--is the distribution of current and accurate information about reading instruction.

A second political consideration had more immediate impact on Kentucky's textbook adoption process. The Kentucky legislature did not appropriate sufficient funds to enable the state to purchase all of the textbooks for the 1985-86 adoption cycle. Instead, the State Department of Education was placed on a continuation budget that provided only enough money to purchase replacements for consumable items and for some new materials. The results of a survey of local school districts encouraged the

Superintendent of Public Instruction to delay purchasing new reading programs for one to two years. The delay in purchasing new textbooks meant that local districts would use their current reading programs for seven to eight years rather than the scheduled six-year period.

Of interest to all people concerned with adoption of textbooks--the publishers, the adoption committees, and the public--is that many of the Kentucky school districts were pleased with this development. They were pleased for a number of reasons. Many of the districts expressed satisfaction with the reading programs they were using; some districts expressed concern that the same economic constraints evident at the state level would prevent them from purchasing the supplemental materials for a new reading series; some of the districts expressed relief that they would not have to undergo the disruptive one- to two-year period of adjustment associated with learning how to implement a new basal program.

The school districts' reaction to the delay provides some insight into their perspective on the textbook adoption process. People tend to assume that school districts benefit when they adopt more up-to-date programs; yet, the reactions of many of the Kentucky school districts to not being funded for new programs seem to indicate that the costs--in both money and human effort--of adopting new programs are excessive.

The message that came from these school districts seems fairly straightforward. The challenge--to publishers, program authors, reading researchers, adoption committees, criteria

committees, and other reading professionals--is to assure that new basal reading programs are worthy of the financial and personal investment required to purchase and implement them. The new basal reading programs should not only look better, but be better, so as to be more useful (and desirable) tools for teachers to use as they go about their important job of teaching children to read.

References

Allington, R. (1986). Policy constraints and effective compensatory reading instruction: A review. In J. V. Hoffman (Ed.), Effective teaching of reading: Research and practice (pp. 261-289). Newark, DE: International Reading Association.

Bowler, M. (1978). Textbook publishers try to please all, but first they woo the heart of Texas. The Reading Teacher, 31, 514-518.

Caplan, N. (1979). The two-communities theory and knowledge utilization. American Behavioral Scientist, 22, 459-470.

Courtland, M. C., Farr, R., Harris, P., Tarr, J. R., & Treece, L. J. (1983). A case study of the Indiana state reading textbook adoption process. Unpublished manuscript, Bloomington, Indiana.

Drew, K. (1984). "Look-and-say" reading method draws ire of author. The Paducah Sun, Paducah, Kentucky, p. E-4.

Durkin, D. (1981). Reading comprehension instruction in five basal reader series. Reading Research Quarterly, 16, 515-544.

Educational Products Information Exchange. (1977). Report on a national study of the nature and the quality of instructional materials most used by teachers and learners (Tech. Rep. No. 76). New York: EPIE Institute.

English, R. (1980). The politics of textbook adoption. Phi Delta Kappan, 62, 275-278.

Farr, R., & Tulley, M. A. (1985). Do adoption committees perpetuate mediocre textbooks? Kappan, 66, 467-471.

Farr, R., Tulley, M., & Rayford, L. (1984). Local district adoption practices in the nonadoption states, mimeo. Bloomington: Indiana University.

Fisher, C., Berliner, D., Filby, N., Marliave, R., Cohen, L., Dishaw, M., & Moore, J. (1978). Teaching and learning in elementary schools: A summary of the beginning teacher evaluation study. San Francisco: Far West Laboratory for Educational Research and Development.

Goldstein, P. (1978). Changing the American textbook: Law, politics and technology. Lexington, MA: D. C. Heath & Co.

Helfrey, J. (1979). Are textbooks harming your children? Melford, MI: Mott Media.

Johnson, D. D., & Barrett, T. C. (1981). Prose comprehension: A descriptive analysis of instructional practices. In C. M. Santa & B. L. Hayes (Eds.), Children's prose comprehension, research and practice (pp. 72-102). Newark, DE: International Reading Association.

Keith, S. (1981). Politics of textbook selection (Research Report No. 81-AT). Palo Alto, CA: Stanford University Institute for Research on Educational Finance and Governence.

Kentucky State textbook program: Adoptions, purchases and utilization (1982). Frankfort, KY: Kentucky Department of Education, Raymond Barber, Superintendent.

Lindblom, C. E., & Cohen, D. K. (1979). Usable knowledge: Social science and social problem solving. New Haven, CT: Yale University Press.

Mason, J., & Osborn, J. (1983). When do children begin "reading to learn?" A survey of practices in grades two through five (Tech. Rep. No. 261). Urbana: University of Illinois, Center for the Study of Reading.

Osborn, J., Wilson, P., & Anderson, R. C. (1985). Reading education: Foundation for a literate America. Lexington, MA: Lexington.

Powell, D. A. (1985). Retrospective case studies of individual and group decision making in district-level elementary reading textbook selection. Unpublished dissertation, Indiana University.

Shannon, P. (1983). The use of commercial reading materials in American elementary schools. Reading Research Quarterly, 19, 68-85.

Tulley, M. A. (1983). A descriptive study of the intents of selected State-level textbook adoption policies. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, Indiana University.

Winograd, P. (1986). Contexts of literacy: Translating research into policy. In T. Raphael (Ed.), The contexts of school based literacy. New York: Random House.

Wixson, K. K., & Peters, C. W. (1984). Reading redefined: A Michigan reading association position paper. The Michigan Reading Journal, 17, 4-7.

Footnote

[1]Some of this research and its implications for instruction is described in Reading education: Foundation for a literate America (Osborn, Wilson, & Anderson). Research that illuminates the current dynamic and interactive process view of comprehension is described in chapters by Beck, Hansen, Palincsar, Bereiter, Wilson, and Anderson.

APPENDIX

KENTUCKY STATE DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION

GUIDES FOR EVALUATING BASAL READING SERIES

These two guides are designed to help schools decide which basal reading series is most appropriate for their particular needs. The Teacher's Guide was developed for teachers who may not have the time to evaluate the entire series, but who are interested in examining the basal reading materials for their specific grade level. The Committee's Guide is a longer guide designed to be used by a committee that has the time to make a more complete evaluation of the entire series.

The questions in these two guides are meant to stimulate discussion among teachers about important aspects of basal reader series. It is hoped that such discussions will enable teachers to select the basal series that best fits the children in their classes.

The questions in these two guides also reflect certain assumptions about the nature of good reading instruction. Some of the more important assumptions are:

1. Reading instruction should be aimed at developing independent, flexible readers who can understand and use a wide variety of written materials to achieve a wide variety of purposes.

2. Instruction in any aspect of reading (e.g., phonics, comprehension, study skills) should be viewed by the teacher and the students as a way to become an independent, flexible reader.

3. The material used to teach children how to read should be as interesting, as relevant, and as well-written as possible. In short, the students' reading material should be worth reading.

4. Teachers' manuals should provide teachers with explicit suggestions on how to teach students to become independent, flexible readers.

5. Reading instruction should also be aimed at helping children develop a love of reading. The best teachers are those who supplement the basal readers with plenty of activities like reading aloud to children and free reading periods in order to ensure that their children learn about the personal satisfaction that can be obtained from reading.

TEACHER'S GUIDE FOR EVALUATING BASAL READING SERIES

This two-page guide is designed for teachers who may not have the time to evaluate an entire series, but who are interested in examining the basal reading materials for their specific grade level. Some questions will be more relevant than others, depending upon the grade level. The three-point rating scale (WEAK-AVERAGE-STRONG) may be used to make comparisons between basal reading series. For example, some series may be weaker than the others in meeting the specific curriculum objectives of a particular district or providing explanations on how to teach various comprehension skills.

Reviewer _____

Series _____

Grade Level _____

I. TEACHER'S MANUAL	WEAK	AVERAGE	STRONG
1. Do the objectives of the series meet those in your curriculum guide and/or the Kentucky Essential Skills for this grade?	1	2	3
2. Does the manual provide detailed guidance in adapting instruction for individual differences?	1	2	3
3. Does the manual provide detailed instructions for teaching pupils a variety of reliable word recognition strategies appropriate for this level?	1	2	3
4. Does the manual provide detailed instructions on how to help pupils develop the comprehension skills appropriate for this level? For example, does the manual suggest ways to explain to children how to get the plot of a story or to distinguish between facts and opinions?	1	2	3
5. Does the manual provide detailed instructions on how to help pupils read various types of materials including stories, articles, and poetry? For example, does the manual provide suggestions on how to help pupils vary their reading rate for different types of material?	1	2	3

		WEAK	AVERAGE	STRONG
6.	Does the manual provide detailed instructions on how to help pupils use the vocabulary skills appropriate for this level? For example, does the manual provide suggestions on how to help pupils use context clues or use a glossary?	1	2	3
7.	Are the lesson plans presented in the manual complete, clear in format, and easy to follow?	1	2	3
8.	Does the manual provide suggestions and activities that will help pupils develop the motivation to read on their own?	1	2	3
II.	PUPIL TEXTS			
1.	Are the stories and articles well-written, meaningful, and worth reading? This is as important at the lower grades as it is at the upper grades.	1	2	3
2.	Will your pupils be interested in reading these stories, articles, and poems?	1	2	3
3.	Will the stories, articles, and poems match your pupils' language, vocabulary, and experiential backgrounds?	1	2	3
III.	WORKBOOKS AND PRACTICE MATERIALS			
1.	Do the materials provided in the workbooks reinforce, lesson by lesson, the specific skills and activities presented in the teacher's edition?	1	2	3
2.	Does the workbook provide practice in worthwhile reading and writing activities rather than irrelevant busywork?	1	2	3
3.	Are the instructions provided to the pupils easy to understand?	1	2	3
4.	Does the workbook contain extra materials for pupils who need extra practice?	1	2	3

COMMITTEE'S GUIDE FOR EVALUATING BASAL READING SERIES

This five-page guide is designed to be used by a committee that has the time to make a more complete examination of the basal reading series. It contains a number of questions in addition to those contained in the shorter Teacher's Guide. The questions in this guide are meant to stimulate discussion among teachers about important aspects of basal reader series. It is hoped that such discussions will enable teachers to select the basal series that best fits their children. The three-point rating scale (WEAK-AVERAGE-STRONG) may be used to make comparisons between basal reading series. For example, some series may be weaker than the others in meeting the specific curriculum objectives of a particular district or providing explanations on how to teach various comprehension skills.

Reviewer _____

Series _____

Grade Levels _____

I. GENERAL CONSIDERATIONS	WEAK	AVERAGE	STRONG
1. Do the objectives of the series meet those in your curriculum guide and/or the Kentucky Essential Skills?	1	2	3
2. Does the difficulty of the reading materials increase gradually from level to level and from grade to grade?	1	2	3
3. Is the management system complete and easy to use?	1	2	3
4. Does the series provide detailed guidance in adapting instruction for individual differences?	1	2	3
5. Does the series provide suggestions and activities that will help pupils develop the motivation to read on their own?	1	2	3
6. Are the teachers' editions convenient to handle, clear in format, and well-organized?	1	2	3
7. Are the lesson plans presented in the teachers' editions complete, clear in format, and easy to follow?	1	2	3

II. QUALITY OF CONTENT	WEAK	AVERAGE	STRONG
1. Are the stories and articles well-written, meaningful, and worth reading? This is as important at the lower grades as it is at the upper grades.	1	2	3
2. Will your pupils be interested in reading these stories, articles, and poems?	1	2	3
3. Will the stories, articles, and poems match your pupils' language, vocabulary, and experiential backgrounds?	1	2	3
4. Does the series present a sequential strand of instruction that will help pupils develop an understanding and appreciation for good literature?	1	2	3
III. COMPREHENSION			
1. Does the series emphasize reading for meaning from the first and throughout the series?	1	2	3
2. Does the manual provide detailed instructions on how to help pupils develop comprehension skills? For example, does the manual suggest ways to explain to children how to get the plot of a story or to distinguish between facts and opinions?	1	2	3
3. Does the series provide appropriate models of the language skills (e.g., punctuation, capitalization) necessary for reading with understanding?	1	2	3
4. Does the manual provide detailed instructions on how to help pupils read various types of materials including stories, articles, and poetry? For example, does the manual provide suggestions on how to help pupils vary their reading rate for different types of material?	1	2	3
5. Does the manual provide detailed instructions on how to help pupils relate what they read to their own experiences and to use reading skills outside the classroom?	1	2	3

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

IV. VOCABULARY	WEAK	AVERAGE	STRONG
1. Does the manual provide detailed instructions on how to help pupils develop vocabulary skills? For example, does the manual provide suggestions on how to help pupils use context clues or use a glossary?	1	2	3
2. Does the series relate new and unfamiliar concepts or words to student experiences and clarify them in content?	1	2	3
3. Are definitions understandable and more concrete than the concept being defined?	1	2	3
4. Is there a cumulative listing of the vocabulary words included in the Teachers' Manual?	1	2	3
V. WORD RECOGNITION			
1. Does the manual provide detailed instructions for teaching pupils a variety of reliable word recognition strategies?	1	2	3
2. Do the beginning levels of the series teach the use of context plus beginning consonant sounds in determining unrecognized words in print?	1	2	3
3. Do later levels in the series continue to stress the use of context clues as a parallel strategy with decoding in the identification of unfamiliar words?	1	2	3
4. Does the series consistently teach word-recognition in a meaning context; that is, sounds as parts of words and words in meaning-carrying phrases and sentences?	1	2	3

VI. BEGINNING READING	WEAK	AVERAGE	STRONG
1. Are tests available for assessing pre-reading skills to assist the first grade teacher in organizing for instruction?	1	2	3
2. Does the manual provide detailed suggestions on how to help pupils understand the useful nature of written language? For example, are there environmental print activities or suggestions for helping children make their own books?	1	2	3
3. Are important, high-frequency words introduced and mastered in the pre-reading program so pupils can have success in their first reading experiences?	1	2	3
4. Are there plenty of opportunities for the teacher to read enjoyable stories to the children?	1	2	3
VII. STUDY SKILLS			
1. Does the series provide detailed instructions for teaching pupils the skills involved in organizing and retaining information?	1	2	3
2. Does the series provide detailed instructions for teaching pupils when and how to use reference aids?	1	2	3
3. Does the series provide direct experiences in learning how to study in content textbooks?	1	2	3
4. Does the series provide detailed instructions in how to improve pupils' test-taking skills?	1	2	3
VIII. WORKBOOKS AND PRACTICE MATERIALS			
1. Do the materials provided in the workbooks reinforce, lesson by lesson, the specific skills and activities presented in the teacher's edition?	1	2	3

		WEAK	AVERAGE	STRONG
2.	Does the workbook provide practice in worthwhile reading and writing activities rather than irrelevant busywork?	1	2	3
3.	Are the instructions provided to the pupils easy to understand?	1	2	3
4.	Does the workbook contain extra materials for pupils who need extra practice?	1	2	3
5.	Will your pupils find some of the workbook activities enjoyable, as well as instructional?	1	2	3